

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-18, and 21-36 are pending, claims 3, 19, 20, 37 and 38 being cancelled herein without prejudice.

Claims 1, 15, 16, 25, 33 and 34 are amended.

Claims 9, 14, 17, 18, 27, 32, 35 and 36 are withdrawn pursuant to a restriction requirement.

The amendments to claims 15-16 and 33-34 and the cancellation of claims 19-20 and 37-38 are believed to overcome the objections to the Specification, the rejections under Section 112, and the double patenting objection.

Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-16, 19-26, 28-31, 33-34, and 37-38 were examined and stand rejected as follows:

1-2, 4-8, 10-13, 15-16, 19, 28-31, 33-34 and 37	35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,618,163 to Hasler
3, 20-26 and 38	35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,618,163 to Hasler in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,947,519 to Aloe

Independent claim 1 is the only independent claim and has been amended to incorporate the general subject matter of claim 3, with further amendment. Accordingly, the rejections under Section 102(b) is obviated.

Turning to the rejection under Section 103(a), the Examiner acknowledges that Hasler does not disclose machining. The Examiner asserts that Aloe teaches machining a casting to provide the casting with a socket of a size appropriate for a selected metallic rail, and that it would have been obvious to modify Hasler to include machining the casters after selecting a rail size for the purpose of determining the attachment locations of the components.

In response, it is noted that claim 1 as amended requires that at least one casting is “formed with” a plurality of differently sized features, each of which is capable of defining a differently sized socket.” This differs from former claim 3, which merely required that the features were capable of “defining” a plurality of socket sizes.

As will be appreciated, the claimed machining is readily distinguished from conventional machining operations, and, most notably, the castings of amended claim 1 already have the correctly sized sockets, which can be revealed by machining of the casting. In this regard, the machining step does not require high precision, since the “differently sized features” are already correctly sized. All that is required is the removal of material to

Application No. 10/509,568  
uncover the already formed sockets. This is not even remotely obvious in view of the cited references.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for a one month or other appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension, along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, be charged to our Deposit Account No. 12-2355.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By:



Robert O. Fox

Registration No. 34,165

April 29, 2010  
P. O. Box 1871  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37901  
(865) 546-4305